

REMARKS

The following remarks are provided in response to the Final Office Action (“office action”) mailed April 20, 2009 in which the office action:

- rejected claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-26 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,691,803 to Song et al. (hereinafter Song) in view of US 5,712,698 to Poschenrieder et al. (hereinafter Poschenrieder).
- rejected claims 1, 3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-26 and 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 7,283,205 to Mackey et al. (hereinafter Mackey).

The applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above referenced patent application for the following reasons:

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-26 and 29-33 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-26 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song in view Poschenrieder. Claims 26 and 29 are herein canceled without prejudice.

Independent claim 1, from which claims 3, 6-8 and 30-33 depend, is directed to a light source. The light source includes the features, “*a light source head,*” “*a first set of poles coupled to the light source head ...,*” and “*a second set of poles coupled to the light source head*” Independent claim 11, from which claims 12-14 and 16 depend, is directed to a method including similar features. Independent claim 17, from which claims 18-19 and 21-25 depend, is directed to an apparatus also including similar features. That is, in claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25 and 30-33, the Applicants teach

and claim a light source including a first set of light sources (poles) and a second set of light sources. (*See* Applicants' specification, e.g., paragraph 0002.)

Song fails to disclose a light source including a first set of light sources and a second set of light sources. Song only discloses a filter 6b comprising eight exposure holes. The filter 6b of Song is associated with a single light source. (*See* Song, e.g., col. 4, lines 9-19.) That is, there is only one single light source in Song, light from which is transmitted through the filter 6b of Song. By contrast, the Applicants teach and claim a light source having multiple light sources (e.g., having two sets of light sources, or poles). It is noted that the term "*quadrupole filter*" in Song merely refers to the number of exposure holes formed in a filter and not to multiple individual light sources. (*See* Song, e.g., col. 3, lines 43-45.) Accordingly, the light that is filtered by filter 6b of Song is derived from a single light source. Said another way, the light entering one exposure hole of the filter 6b of Song is from the same light source as the light that enters another exposure hole of the filter. Therefore, Song cannot possibly be construed as disclosing multiple light sources. As such, **Song fails to disclose, "a first set of poles coupled to the light source head ...," and "a second set of poles coupled to the light source head ...,"** as taught and claimed by the Applicants. Poschenrieder fails to cure the above noted deficiencies of Song because Poschenrieder discloses only a single light source 10, light from which is passed through an aperture plate 12. (*See* Poschenrieder, e.g., col. 2 lines 48-59 and Fig. 1.)

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25 and 30-33.

Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-26 and 29-33 rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-26 and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackey. Claims 26 and 29 are herein canceled without prejudice.

As described above, in claims 1, 3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25 and 30-33 the Applicants teach and claim a light source including a first set of light sources (poles) and a second set of light sources. Mackey fails to disclose a light source including a first set of light sources and a second set of light sources. Mackey only discloses a diffractive optical element (DOE) 40, which is essentially a filter. The DOE 40 of Mackey is associated with a single light source (illuminator 10). (See Mackey, e.g., col. 4, lines 5-13 and Fig. 10.) That is, there is only one single light source 10 in Mackey, light from which is transmitted through holes of the DOE 40 of Mackey. Therefore, the light entering one exposure hole of the DOE is from the same light source as the light that enters another exposure hole of the DOE. Accordingly, Mackey cannot possibly be construed as disclosing multiple light sources. By contrast, the Applicants teach and claim a light source having multiple light sources (e.g., having two sets of light sources, or poles). As such, **Mackey fails to disclose, “a first set of poles coupled to the light source head ...,” and “a second set of poles coupled to the light source head ...,”** as taught and claimed by the Applicants.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to remove the rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-8, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25 and 30-33.

CONCLUSION

The applicants submit that they have overcome the office action's rejections of the claims and that they have the right to claim the invention as set forth in the listed claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicant(s) hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, L.L.P.

June 22, 2009

Date

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
Telephone: (503) 439-8778
Facsimile: (503) 439-6073

/Justin K. Brask/

Justin K. Brask
Reg. No. 61,080